

CHAPTER 4

Alternatives

A. Overview

According to CEQA, an EIR must describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives, and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the proposed project's significant effects. Additionally, a no project alternative must be analyzed. An EIR must evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.

The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, the alternatives must be limited to ones that meet the project objectives, are feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen at least one of the significant environmental effects of the project. "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.

The EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives and the information the lead agency relied on when making the selection. It also should identify any alternatives considered, but rejected as infeasible by the lead agency during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons for the exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects.

This chapter identifies alternatives that attain some of the project objectives, are feasible, and could avoid or substantially lessen environmental impacts, plus the No Project Alternative. This chapter concludes by analyzing the environmentally superior alternative.

B. Description and Basis of Selection of Alternatives

This chapter describes and analyzes the No Project Alternative and four additional alternatives selected due to their potential to attain some of the project objectives and to lessen or avoid some of the significant environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

According to the *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(e), an EIR is required to evaluate and analyze the impacts of a No Project Alternative. The purpose of evaluating the No Project Alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project. However, the No Project Alternative is not the baseline for determining whether the proposed project's impacts are significant, unless it is identical to the existing environmental setting analysis that establishes the baseline.

At the time the NOP is published, the No Project analysis must discuss the existing conditions and what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved based on current plans and consistencies with available infrastructure and community services.

The discussion of the No Project Alternative normally proceeds along one of two lines. When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the No Project Alternative will be the continuation of the plan, policy, or operation into the future. On the other hand, if the project is an individual development project on an identifiable location, the No Project Alternative should compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state. If other future uses of the land are predictable, such land uses should also be discussed as possible no project conditions and the project should be compared to those uses.

C. Alternatives Considered but Rejected

According to *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6, an EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are potentially feasible and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration, and which are clearly infeasible. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered. This section identifies alternatives considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible, and provides a brief explanation of the reasons for their exclusion. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives (see Chapter 2), are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects.

Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, General Plan consistency, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.

The project applicant, Seaport Marina, LLC, includes a partner that is a national developer of homes and commercial projects. They have numerous projects underway at a given time and continuously look for sites that represent an opportunity. If there were other sites in the City, the applicant could conceivably simultaneously develop such

other properties with this one. The proposed project is specifically proposed for this underdeveloped site. Another site would constitute another project.

The City identified three alternative sites with the criterion of finding infill sites that could be redeveloped to increase high-quality housing and economic opportunities. As briefly discussed below, none of these sites are environmentally superior to the project site and the applicant does not control any of the sites:

- Tank Farm Site (located between the San Gabriel River and the Los Cerritos Channel): This site is 16.7-acres and is currently zoned PD-1 Subarea 19 that allows for industrial land uses. This site was rejected as the applicant does not control the site and it is currently being proposed to be developed as a Home Depot.
- Oil Operators: The Oil Operators site located at 712 West Baker Street. The site is 13.28-acres and is zoned for single-family residential standard lots (R-1-N). The site was eliminated from consideration as it has limited access (primary access route would be through a residential area) and the applicant does not control the site.
- Robertshaw Control Company: Located at 100 W. Victoria Street, this 7.88-acres site is zoned General Industrial. This site was rejected, because the applicant does not control the site. In addition, this site is one of the few remaining industrial sites in the City, which the City would like keep in order to maintain its economic base.

D. Project Alternatives

Alternatives to the proposed project are described below. Unless otherwise stated, all alternatives are assumed to include similar access, surface and subterranean parking, landscape, and infrastructure improvements similar to the proposed project. It is also assumed for the analysis that the construction schedule would be similar to the proposed project, since all the alternatives (except the No Project) would be similar in size.

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed, and the existing Seaport Marina Hotel would continue to operate. The current ingress/egress on PCH would remain, and other circulation elements would generally remain in their existing configuration.

Alternative 1 would not address the need for high-quality housing nor would it generate additional tax revenues associated with the proposed project and the site would continue to be underutilized. These needs are identified as high priorities for the City of Long Beach in both the Citywide Strategic Plan and the LUE of the General Plan. Alternative 1 would not meet any of the project objectives.

Environmental Impact

Aesthetics

Aesthetic impacts under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Under Alternative 1, the existing hotel would remain and no new elements would be introduced in the project area. No impacts would occur.

Air Quality

The proposed project would result in significant ROC (construction) and NO_x (operational) emissions. Air pollution emissions are associated with construction activities and traffic, as there would be no new development under this alternative, there would be no construction activities or increase in operational traffic and associated emissions. Therefore, under Alternative 1, construction and operational mobile and stationary emissions would not increase. No impact would occur.

Cultural Resources

The project site is currently developed with a hotel and no known archaeological, paleontological, or human remains exist on the project site. With mitigation, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact regarding the potential loss of an unknown resource. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in any excavation or grading and therefore, no impact would occur.

Geology and Soils

Impacts to geologic issues under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Since there would be no increase in population at the project site under Alternative 1, there would be no additional exposure to seismic risk. In addition, as no grading would be completed, there is no potential for soil erosion or slope failure from excavation. No impact would occur.

Hazards

Impacts regarding hazards under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. As Alternative 1 does not include demolition of the existing hotel, grading or excavation, potential impacts associated with exposure of people and property to the existing site hazards (i.e., ACMs and LBP or petroleum hydrocarbons associated with previous site uses) would not occur. No impact would occur.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and NPDES

Impacts from the proposed project regarding hydrology and water quality issues would be less than significant with mitigation. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in modifications to the existing drainage patterns or volume of storm water runoff. No

construction activities would occur and therefore there is no potential to violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No impact would occur.

Land Use

Land use impacts with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. Under Alternative 1, no discretionary approvals would be required as the site would continue under its current use. No impact would occur.

Noise

Noise impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant. With implementation of Alternative 1, existing ambient noise levels would continue and no impacts would occur.

Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. Since there would be no increase in population with implementation of Alternative 1, no impacts would occur.

Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in an increase in population at the project site and therefore would not result in an increased need for public services and utilities in the project area. No impact would occur.

Recreation

Recreational impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not result in an increase in population at the project site and therefore would not result in an increased need for recreation services. No impact would occur.

Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to area traffic would be significant and adverse with implementation of the proposed project. Under Alternative 1, no development would occur on the site and therefore traffic would not increase. No impact would occur.

Alternative 2: Retail Alternative

Alternative 2 (Retail Alternative) would include the construction of 350,000 square feet of retail space. Alternative 2 would likely provide at least two large big box anchors and

smaller retail land uses, in addition to other ancillary uses such as restaurants, a fitness center, and other related services.

Under this alternative, it is assumed that structures would be similar to the proposed project in terms of height, density, and mass. Similar to the proposed project, it is assumed that subterranean and surface parking would be provided.

Alternative 2 would be consistent with existing land use designations and would not require a General Plan or LCP Amendment to allow for the residential land uses. However, it is assumed under this alternative the design and layout of the site would be similar, therefore, Alternative 2 would require a Site Plan Review, a Tentative Subdivision Map, Standards Variances for open space and the setback along Second Street and a Local Coastal Development Permit. The Retail Alternative would meet six of the seven objectives of the proposed project in terms of providing a sales-tax generating economic opportunity that complements the nearby marina area:

- Create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina;
- Provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, and access to mass transit;
- Provide an economical reuse of the project site while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties.
- Design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment;
- Enhance the economic vitality of the City of Long Beach and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities; and
- Provide amenities for public access to the marina.

Alternative 2 would not address the City's need for high-quality housing, although it would provide greater economic development and sales tax-generation opportunities for the City as compared to the proposed project.

Environmental Impact

Aesthetics

Aesthetic impacts under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. As the design of Alternative 2 would include many of the same elements as the proposed project, impacts to aesthetic resources would be similar. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

The proposed project would result in significant ROC (construction) and NO_x (operational) emissions. Air pollution emissions are associated with construction activities and traffic. Air quality impacts from with construction activities would be similar to the proposed project; significant and unavoidable. Operational impacts would be greater as the additional retail use associated with Alternative 2 would result in greater number of trips and subsequent increase in air quality as compared to the residential use included in the proposed project. Operational impacts would be greater under Alternative 2 and significant and unavoidable.

Cultural Resources

The project site is currently developed with a hotel and no known archaeological, paleontological, or human remains exist on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 2 would require excavation and grading activities that would be similar to the proposed project. The potential to adversely impact previously unrecorded prehistoric archeological resources, or the anticipated discovery of human would be similar to that of the proposed project. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Impacts to geologic issues under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 2 would result in similar grading and excavation activities as the proposed project and therefore result in similar impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Hazards

Impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. As with the proposed project, Alternative 2 would include demolition of the existing hotel, excavation and grading. Potential impacts associated with exposure of people and property to the existing site hazards (i.e., ACMs and LBPs or petroleum hydrocarbons associated with previous site uses) would be similar as the proposed project. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and NPDES

Impacts from the proposed project regarding hydrology and water quality issues would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 2 would include similar features as the proposed project and require mitigation measures to off-set any potential impacts to hydrology and water quality. As with the proposed project, potential impacts to water quality from increased soil erosion, siltation, or increased surface runoff during construction would be expected to be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of BMPs. As with the proposed project, significant impacts related to

hydrology and water quality resulting from implementation of Alternative 2 would be mitigated to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Land Use

Land use impacts with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. Alternative 2 would be consistent with the existing land use designations and would not require a General Plan or LCP Amendment to allow for residential uses. However, as it is assumed under this alternative that the layout of the site would be similar, Alternative 2 would require Standards Variances for open space and the setback along Second Street. Other required discretionary permits would be a Site Plan Review, a Tentative Subdivision Map and a Local Coastal Development Permit. Impacts would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Noise impacts are associated with construction activities and traffic. Under Alternative 2, noise impacts from construction activities would be similar to the proposed project; less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Operational noise impacts would be incrementally greater as the additional retail use associated with Alternative 2 would result in a greater number of trips. Therefore, traffic-related noise would incrementally increase as compared to proposed project. Operational noise impacts would be greater under Alternative 2, but still less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. There would be no increase in population with implementation of Alternative 2; the proposed project with 425 residential units would respond to a demand for housing. This demand would not be addressed with implementation of Alternative 2. Employment opportunities would increase under this alternative, which would increase the demand for housing in the area. With no new housing proposed for this alternative, impacts to area housing and demand for housing would increase over the proposed project. Generally, retail employees can be found in the local population; most employees would not relocate for most of the retail jobs associated with Alternative 2. Impacts to housing still would be less than significant, but greater than the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to fire and police protection as compared to the proposed project. Impacts to schools would be reduced as compared to the proposed project, as this alternative does not include residential uses. Impacts to wastewater generation would be

78,050 gpd under Alternative 2 as compared to 101,150 gpd under the proposed project. Water consumption would be reduced with implementation of Alternative 2 from 115,840 gpd to 70,000 gpd. Solid waste generation from construction activities would be similar, but operational impacts would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the proposed project, from 2,720 pounds per day to 2,100 pounds per day. Impacts to public services and utilities would be reduced under Alternative 2 and less than significant.

Recreation

Impacts to recreational facilities are mostly related to new residential uses and the subsequent increase in population. Recreational impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. As no residential uses are included in Alternative 2, impacts to recreational facilities in the project vicinity would be reduced over those associated with the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to area traffic would be significant and adverse with implementation of the proposed project. Operational impacts under Alternative 2 would increase as retail uses generate more traffic than residential uses. This alternative could also impact more intersections compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, operational traffic impacts with implementation of Alternative 2 would be significant.

Alternative 3: Reduced Project Alternative

Implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would include construction of 140,000 square feet of retail space and 340 residential units, a reduction of 20 percent compared to the proposed project.

The Reduced Project Alternative would include similar elements as the proposed project with a similar building design and characteristics. Under Alternative 3, the building height would be reduced to one- to three-stories, as compared to up to five stories (a maximum of 68 feet) under the proposed project. This alternative includes all other elements and amenities described for the proposed project (landscaping, etc.). Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include subterranean and surface parking.

Alternative 3 would require the same discretionary actions as the proposed project.

The Reduced Project Alternative would meet all of the objectives of the proposed project, although it would reduce housing and sales tax-generation opportunities in the City as compared to the proposed project.

Environmental Impact

Aesthetics

Aesthetic impacts under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 3 would include many of the same elements (although reduced in height and bulk) as the proposed project. Therefore impacts would be less than significant and slightly less than the proposed project.

Air Quality

The proposed project would result in significant ROC (construction) and NO_x (operational) emissions. Air pollution emissions are associated with construction activities and traffic. Air quality impacts from with construction activities would be similar, but of shorter duration (due to the reduced size of this alternative) compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, construction impacts would still be significant and unavoidable. Operational impacts would be reduced as the retail and residential uses are less under Alternative 3, and would therefore result in a smaller number of trips and subsequent reduction in air quality as compared to the proposed project. Operational impacts would be reduced under Alternative 3, but still potentially significant and unavoidable.

Cultural Resources

The project site is currently developed with a hotel and no known archaeological, paleontological, or human remains exist on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 3 would require excavation and grading activities that would be similar to the proposed project. The potential to adversely impact previously unrecorded prehistoric archeological resources, or the anticipated discovery of human would be similar to that of the proposed project. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Impacts to geologic issues under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 3 would result in similar grading and excavation activities as the proposed project and therefore result in similar impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Hazards

Impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. As with the proposed project, Alternative 3 would include demolition of the existing hotel, excavation and grading. Potential impacts associated with exposure of people and property to the existing site hazards (i.e., ACMs and LBPs or petroleum hydrocarbons associated with previous site uses) would be similar to the proposed project. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and NPDES

Impacts from the proposed project regarding hydrology and water quality issues would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 3 would include similar features as the proposed project and require mitigation measures to off-set any potential impacts to hydrology and water quality. As with the proposed project, potential impacts to water quality from increased soil erosion, siltation, or increased surface runoff during construction would be expected to be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of BMPs. As with the proposed project, significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality resulting from implementation of Alternative 3 would be mitigated to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Land Use

Land use impacts with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. Alternative 3 would require the same discretionary actions as the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant and the same as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Noise impacts are associated with construction activities and traffic. Under Alternative 3, noise impacts from construction activities would be similar to the proposed project; less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Operational noise impacts would be less as the proposed uses associated with Alternative 3 would be reduced as compared to the proposed project and result in fewer trips. Therefore, traffic-related noise would be incrementally reduced as compared to the proposed project. With mitigation, operational noise impacts would be reduced under Alternative 3, but are still anticipated to be less than significant with mitigation.

Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. With implementation of Alternative 3, impacts associated with increased population on the site would be reduced as there are fewer residential units. Employment opportunities would also be less under this alternative. Impacts would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Public Service and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 3 would result in reduced impacts to fire and police protection and schools as compared to the proposed project. Impacts to wastewater generation would be reduced to 81,795 gpd under Alternative 3 as compared to 101,150 gpd under the proposed project. Water consumption would be reduced with implementation of Alternative 2 from 115,840 gpd to 93,450 gpd. Solid waste generation from construction activities would be similar, but

operational impacts would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the proposed project, from 2,720 pounds per day to 2,200 pounds per day. Impacts to public services and utilities would be reduced under Alternative 3 and less than significant.

Recreation

Recreational impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. Impacts to recreational facilities are mostly related to new residential uses and the subsequent increase in population. As residential uses would be reduced with implementation of Alternative 3, impacts to recreational facilities in the project vicinity would be less compared to those associated with the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to area traffic would be significant and adverse with implementation of the proposed project. Traffic impacts would decrease as the retail and residential uses would be reduced and would generate less traffic than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, operational traffic impacts with implementation of Alternative 3 are still anticipated to be significant.

Alternative 4: Hotel/Retail Alternative

The Hotel/Retail Alternative would include 170,000 square feet of retail space (as with the proposed project) and a 130-room hotel (instead of the 425 residential units in the proposed project). No residential units would be constructed. In addition to the 130 guest rooms, the hotel would include other amenities such as banquet and meeting rooms, recreation areas (outdoor pool) and other ancillary services.

Under this alternative, it is assumed that structures would be similar to the proposed project in terms of height, density, and mass. Similar to the proposed project, it is assumed that subterranean and surface parking would be provided similar to the proposed project.

Alternative 4 would be consistent with the existing land use designations and would not require a General Plan or LCP Amendment to allow for residential uses. However, it is assumed under this alternative the design and layout of the site would be similar. Therefore, Alternative 4 would require Site Plan Review, a Tentative Subdivision Map, Standards Variances for open space and the setback along Second Street, and a Local Coastal Development permit.

Alternative 4 would meet all of the project objectives of the proposed project and would provide a sales-tax generating economic opportunity that complements the nearby marina area.

Alternative 4 would not address the City's need for high-quality housing, although it would provide greater economic development and sales tax-generation opportunities for the City as compared to the proposed project.

Environmental Impact

Aesthetics

Aesthetic impacts under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. As the design of Alternative 4 would include many of the same elements as the proposed project, impacts to aesthetic resources would be similar. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

The proposed project would result in significant ROC (construction) and NO_x (operational) emissions. Air pollution emissions are associated with construction activities and traffic. Air quality impacts from with construction activities for Alternative 4 would be similar to the proposed project; significant and unavoidable. Operational impacts would be greater as the retail/hotel uses associated with Alternative 4 would result in a greater number of trips and subsequent increase in air quality as compared to the residential use included in the proposed project. Operational impacts would be greater under Alternative 4 and significant and unavoidable.

Cultural Resources

The project site is currently developed with a hotel and no known archaeological, paleontological, or human remains exist on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 4 would require excavation and grading activities that would be similar to the proposed project. The potential to adversely impact previously unrecorded prehistoric archeological resources, or the anticipated discovery of human would be similar to that of the proposed project. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Impacts to geologic issues under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 4 would result in similar grading and excavation activities as the proposed project and therefore result in similar impacts. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Hazards

Impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. As with the proposed project, Alternative 4 would include demolition of the existing hotel, excavation and grading. Potential impacts associated with exposure of people and property to the existing site hazards (i.e., ACMs and LBPs or petroleum hydrocarbons

associated with previous site uses) would be similar as the proposed project. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and NPDES

Impacts from the proposed project regarding hydrology and water quality issues would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 4 would include similar features as the proposed project and require mitigation measures to off-set any potential impacts to hydrology and water quality. As with the proposed project, potential impacts to water quality from increased soil erosion, siltation, or increased surface runoff during construction would be expected to be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of BMPs. As with the proposed project, significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality resulting from implementation of Alternative 4 would be mitigated to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Land Use

Land use impacts with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. Alternative 4 would be consistent with the existing land use designations and would not require a General Plan or LCP Amendment to allow for residential uses. However, as it is assumed under this alternative that the design and layout of the site would be similar, Alternative 4 would require Standards Variances for open space and the setback along Second Street. The other required discretionary permits would include a Site Plan Review, a Tentative Subdivision Map and a Local Coastal Development Permit. Impacts would be less than significant and reduced as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Noise impacts are associated with construction activities and traffic. Under Alternative 4, noise impacts from construction activities would be similar to the proposed project; less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Operational noise impacts would be greater as the retail/hotel uses associated with Alternative 4 would result in a greater number of trips. Therefore, traffic-related noise would incrementally increase as compared to proposed project. Operational noise impacts would be greater under Alternative 4, but are still anticipated to be less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. There would be no increase in population with implementation of Alternative 4; the proposed project with 425 residential units would respond to a demand for housing. This demand would not be addressed with implementation of Alternative 4. Employment opportunities would increase under this alternative, which increase demand for housing in the area. With no new housing proposed for this alternative, impacts to

area housing and demand for housing would increase over the proposed project. Generally, retail/hotel employees can be found in the local population; most employees would not relocate for most of the jobs associated with Alternative 4. Impacts to housing still would be less than significant, but greater than the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to fire and police protection as compared to the proposed project. Impacts to schools would be reduced as compared to the proposed project, as this alternative does not include residential uses. Impacts to wastewater generation would be reduced to 57,410 gpd under Alternative 4 as compared to 101,150 gpd under the proposed project. Water consumption would be reduced with implementation of Alternative 4 from 115,840 gpd to 52,720 gpd. Solid waste generation from construction activities would be similar, but operational impacts would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the proposed project, from 2,720 pounds per day to 1,540 pounds per day. Impacts to public services and utilities would be reduced under Alternative 4 and less than significant.

Recreation

Recreational impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. Impacts to recreational facilities are mostly related to new residential uses and the subsequent increase in population. As no residential uses are included in Alternative 4, impacts to recreational facilities in the project vicinity would be reduced over those associated with the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to area traffic would be significant and adverse with implementation of the proposed project. Transportation impacts would increase as retail/hotel uses generate more traffic than residential uses. As with the proposed project, operational traffic impacts with implementation of Alternative 4 would be significant.

Alternative 5: Oil Pipeline Relocation

Under this alternative, the 170,000 square feet of retail and 425 residential units included as the proposed project would be constructed. However, the existing oil pipeline/easement located on the eastern boundary of the project site would be moved 16 feet east of its current location (within the right-of-way of PCH). This would reduce the project setback along PCH from 28 feet to 20 feet. Implementation of this alternative would also increase the amount of excavation and would result in some disruption to traffic on PCH.

All project components described under the proposed project would be included with Alternative 5. All project objectives for the proposed project would be met with implementation of Alternative 5.

Environmental Impact

Aesthetics

As the design of Alternative 5 would be the similar and include same elements as the proposed project, impacts to aesthetic resources would be similar. Impacts would be less than significant and similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality

Air pollution emissions are associated with construction activities and traffic. Air quality impacts from with construction and operational activities would be the same as those for the proposed project. Impacts would be the same as the proposed project under Alternative 5, significant and unavoidable.

Cultural Resources

The project site is currently developed with a hotel and no known archaeological, paleontological, or human remains exist on the project site. Implementation of Alternative 5 would require excavation and grading activities that would be similar to the proposed project. The potential to adversely impact previously unrecorded prehistoric archeological resources, or the anticipated discovery of human would be similar to that of the proposed project. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant and the same as the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Impacts to geologic issues under the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 5 would result in a greater amount of grading and excavation activities as the proposed project, but impacts would be similar. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Hazards

Impacts from the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. As with the proposed project, Alternative 5 would include demolition of the existing hotel, excavation and grading. Potential impacts associated with exposure of people and property to the existing site hazards (i.e., ACMs and LBPs or petroleum hydrocarbons associated with previous site uses) would be the same as the proposed project. With implementation of mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Hydrology, Water Quality, and NPDES

Impacts from the proposed project regarding hydrology and water quality issues would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 5 would include the same features as the proposed project and require mitigation measures to off-set any potential impacts to hydrology and water quality. As with the proposed project, potential impacts to water quality from increased soil erosion, siltation, or increased surface runoff during construction would be expected to be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of BMPs. As with the proposed project, significant impacts related to hydrology and water quality resulting from implementation of Alternative 5 would be mitigated to a less than significant level with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

Land Use

Land use impacts with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. Alternative 5 would require the same discretionary actions as the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant and the same as compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Noise impacts are associated with construction activities and traffic. Under Alternative 5, noise impacts from with construction activities would be the same as the proposed project; less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Operational noise impacts would be the same, as under Alternative 5 the same number of trips would occur. Therefore, traffic-related noise would be the same as compared to proposed project. Operational noise impacts would be the same under Alternative 5 and less than significant with incorporation of mitigation.

Population and Housing

Impacts to population and housing with implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. Population and housing impacts associated with implementation of Alternative 5 would be the same as those for the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Public Services and Utilities

Impacts to public services and utilities associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant with mitigation. Alternative 5 would result in the same impacts to public services and utilities as compared to the proposed project. Impacts to public services and utilities would be less than significant.

Recreation

Recreational impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. Impacts to recreational facilities would be the same under Alternative 5 as for the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Transportation and Circulation

Impacts to area traffic would be significant and adverse with implementation of the proposed project. Traffic impacts associated with construction and operation activities for Alternative 5 would be the same as those of the proposed project. As with the proposed project, operational traffic impacts with implementation of Alternative 5 would be significant.

E. Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative. The No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project on the basis of minimization or avoidance of physical environmental impacts. However, the No Project Alternative does not meet any of the project objectives. In addition, *CEQA Guidelines* (Section 15126.6(c)) require that, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

A summary comparison of the potential impacts associated with the alternatives and the proposed project is provided in **Table 4.1**. Based on this comparison, Alternative 3, the Reduced Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. Alternative 3 would meet project objectives, but not to the same degree as the project (i.e., Alternative 3 would not provide as much housing, tax revenue, etc.).

**TABLE 4.1
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Retail Alternative	Alternative 3 Reduced Alternative	Alternative 4 Hotel/Retail Alternative	Alternative 5 Oil Pipeline Relocation
Aesthetics						
3A.1: Substantial adverse effect on scenic vista	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3A.2: Substantially degrade scenic resources	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3A.3: Substantially degrade visual character	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3A.4: Create substantial light or glare	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
Air Quality						
3B.1: Construction - temporary adverse impacts to air quality	Significant and adverse	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3B.2: Construction - expose sensitive receptors to increased toxic air contaminants	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3B.3: Operation – adverse impacts to regional ambient air quality	Significant and adverse	No impact	Greater impact	Reduced impact	Greater impact	Similar impact
3B.4: Operation – adverse impacts to localized ambient air quality	Less than significant	No impact	Greater impact, but less than significant	Reduced impact	Greater impact, but less than significant	Similar impact
3B.5: Operations – expose sensitive receptors to increased toxic air contaminants	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impacts	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3B.6: Compatible with regional/local air quality policies	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact

**TABLE 4.1
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES (CONT.)**

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Retail Alternative	Alternative 3 Reduced Alternative	Alternative 4 Hotel/Retail Alternative	Alternative 5 Oil Pipeline Relocation
Cultural Resources						
3C.1: Disturb previously unknown archaeological resources	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3C.2: Disturb previously unknown paleontological resources	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
Geology and Soils						
3D.1: Expose people or structures to seismic events	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3D.2: Result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Greater impact, but less than significant
3D.3: Located on unstable geologic unit	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
Hazards						
3E.1: Located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials site	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
Hydrology, Water Quality, and NPDES						
3F.1: Construction impacts to water quality	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3F.2: Alter site drainage pattern	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
Land Use						
3G.1: Conflict with existing land use plan	Less than significant	No impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact
Noise						
3H.1: Construction – temporary increase in ambient noise	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3H.2: Construction - groundborne vibration	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact

**TABLE 4.1
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES (CONT.)**

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Retail Alternative	Alternative 3 Reduced Alternative	Alternative 4 Hotel/Retail Alternative	Alternative 5 Oil Pipeline Relocation
Noise (cont.)						
3H.3: Operations – permanent increase in noise from mobile sources	Less than significant	No impact	Greater impact, but less than significant	Reduced impact	Greater impact, but less than significant	Similar impact
3H.4: Operations – permanent increase in noise from stationary sources	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3H.5: Operations – groundborne vibration	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
Population and Housing						
3I.1: Substantially induce population growth	Less than significant	No impact	Greater impact, but less than significant	Reduced impact	Greater impact, but less than significant	Similar impact
Public Services and Utilities						
3J.1: Increase demand for fire protection services	Less than significant impact	No impact	Similar impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3J.2: Increase demand for police services	Less than significant impact	No impact	Similar impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact	Similar impact
3J.3: Increase demand for schools	Less than significant impact	No impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact
3J.4: Increase demand for wastewater treatment facilities	Less than significant impact	No impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact
3J.5: Increase demand for water provider	Less than significant impact	No impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact
3J.6: Increase amount of solid waste	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact
Recreation						
3K.1: Conflict with recreation and open space objectives	Less than significant with mitigation	No impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Reduced impact	Similar impact

**TABLE 4.1
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES (CONT.)**

Environmental Issue	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Retail Alternative	Alternative 3 Reduced Alternative	Alternative 4 Hotel/Retail Alternative	Alternative 5 Oil Pipeline Relocation
Transportation and Circulation						
3L.1: Increase traffic in relation to existing load and capacity	Significant and adverse	No impact	Greater impact	Reduced impact, but significant and adverse	Greater impact	Similar impact
3L.2: Exceed established LOS standard	Less than significant	No impact	Greater impact, but less than significant	Reduced impact	Greater impact, but less than significant	Similar impact
3L.3: Inadequate parking capacity	Less than significant	No impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact	Similar impact